Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/780,852	ROSENBERG ET AL.		
	A 4 11 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Jenery A. Brief	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra time of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or 	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alleged non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	/Jeffery A. Brier/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2628	
	-		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants arguments at page 8 first full paragraph concerning the meaning of "inhibits" has been fully considered, however, Examimer Brier proffers that a defintion of "inhibits" in the context of the Baer patent and in the mechanical arts would be "restrain" or "hold back" and not "prevent" since thrust bearings need some clearance in order to operate without binding. In the attached chapter titled "REDUCTION GEARS" in section 13A3 which may be found at http://maritime.org/fleetsub/diesel/ clearance in the thrust bearing is discussed. Section 13A3 states:

13A3. Flexible couplings between pinion and motor shafts. The couplings between the two main motor armature shafts and the pinion shafts of the reduction gear are of the enclosed flexible type. Each coupling consists essentially of two hubs with external spur gears, and two sleeves with internal spur gears. The hubs are pressed on and keyed to their respective shafts. The floating sleeves fit around the hubs so that the spur gear teeth are permanently meshed. The floating sleeves are bolted together.

This type of coupling provides longitudinal flexibility between the driving and driven shafts and thereby permits the pinion to trail the main gear. Movement of the main gear is in turn limited by the clearance in the thrust bearing. The coupling permits a small amount of misalignment of the hubs to occur without causing operational difficulties. However, it is not advisable to operate continuously with the hubs out of alignment because the coupling is not intended to function as a universal joint. Continuous operation with the hubs out of alignment will result in excessive friction and gear teeth wear, and eventually will cause a breakdown

The couplings are lubricated by a continuous stream of oil supplied by the main motor and reduction gear lubricating oil pump. Oil enters through a nozzle and after passing between the gear teeth is discharged through holes in the sleeve.

Applicants arguments at pages 8 to 10 concerning the presence of an aperature in Adelstein and the assertion "However, there is no citation to disclosure of translational movement through an aperture in Adelstein, only a conclusory statement that such a feature is disclosed", see page 9 last sentence of the first full paragaph, has been fully considered, however, with referecence to the Examiner's obvious statement and figures 1-6 of Adelstein, noting figures 2, 3, 4, and 6, and Adelstein's special thrust bearing "embedded in the manipulandum linkage" one of ordinary skill in the art would recognized an aperature is present in the linkage to allow for tangental movement as well as longitudinal movement due to necessary thrust bearing clearances.

In view of the above applicants arguments filed on 09/10/2009 are not persuasive to overcome the rejections set forth in the office action mailed on 07/10/2009.

Continuation of 13. Other:

The claim listing is not being entered because no amendments have been made to the claims.

Attachment: PTO-892

/Jeffery A. Brier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628